

REMARKS

By the present amendment, paragraph [0027] of the specification has been further amended to correct typographical errors. Furthermore, by the present amendment, claims 3, 4, 6 and 13 have been amended and new claims 25 and 26 have been added. Claims 2-26 are pending in this application. Review and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Examiner objects to the disclosure for informalities. More particularly, the Examiner argues that "DIN 19580" appearing on page 15, line 12, is an undefined abbreviation. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection. As set forth in paragraph [0002] of the specification, "DIN 19580" designates an internationally recognized standard that can be used to distinguish between class ratings for drainage grates. Since "DIN 19580" is internationally recognized, it is believed that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the standards designated by "DIN 19580". Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the specification in this regard.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 4, 6, 15 and 16. The Examiner, however, rejects claims 2, 3, 5, 7-14 and 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,767,456 (Middleton et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,553,874 (Thomann et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The proposed combination of Middleton et al. in view of Thomann et al. fails to teach or suggest every limitation of claims 3 and 13. For example, the proposed


combination fails to teach or suggest a reinforcing member including a plurality of slots that are each adapted to receive a metal strip therein "such that the metal strip extends along the inner dimension of the drainage grate and is retained with respect to the reinforcing member by the bottom flanges" as required by each of claims 3 and 13. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the corresponding rejection of claims 3 and 13 since the proposed combination fails to teach or suggest every limitation required by the claims. Applicants further request allowance of claims 2, 4-12 and 14-24 as depending directly or indirectly from one of claims 3 and 13 that are believed to be in condition for allowance as discussed above.

It is believed that this amendment and response is fully responsive to the Official action dated September 12, 2005. Applicants therefore respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Appl. No. 10/823,928
Amdt. Dated December 9, 2005
Reply to Office action of September 12, 2005

It is believed no additional fees are required for this amendment. However, if any additional fees are due, please charge same to Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 36235

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 
Richard A. Sharpe, Reg. No.34722

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700